



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
097087,658	05/30/98	KAMINSKI	51K98-2

GEORGE W WASSON
3123 INDIAN WAY
LAFAYETTE CA 94549

QM21/0423

EXAMINER
WEAVER, S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3727	

DATE MAILED: 04/23/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/087,658

Applicant(s)
KAMINSKI

Examiner
Sue A. Weaver

Group Art Unit
3727



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 16-20 is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) 13-15 is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☒ The drawing(s) filed on May 30, 1998 is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 3727

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the combination of the hinged clip and the bracket members having resilient members extending into the channel, as claimed in claim 15, and the clip being removable in the support member, as claimed in claim 19, must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "42" has been used to designate both the retaining member and money clip, while "54" has been used to identify the curved edge and spring finger. Correction is required.

Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defect can be deferred until the application is allowed by the examiner.

This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES

1. Correction of Informalities -- 37 CFR 1.85; 1097 O.G. 36

New formal drawings must be filed with the changes incorporated therein. The art unit number, application number (including series code) and number of drawing sheets should be written on the reverse side of the drawings. Applicant may delay filing of the new

Art Unit: 3727

drawings until receipt of the "Notice of Allowability" (PTOL-37 or PTO-37). If delayed, the new drawings **MUST** be filed within the **THREE MONTH** shortened statutory period set for reply in the "Notice of Allowability" to avoid extension of time fees.

Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) for filing the corrected drawings (but not for payment of the issue fee). The drawings should be filed as a separate paper with a transmittal letter addressed to the Official Draftsperson.

2. Corrections other than Informalities Noted by Draftsperson on form PTO-948.

All changes to the drawings, other than informalities noted by the Draftsperson, **MUST** be made in the same manner as above except that, normally, a highlighted (preferably red ink) sketch of the changes to be incorporated into the new drawings **MUST** be approved by the examiner before the application will be allowed. No changes will be permitted to be made, other than correction of informalities, unless the examiner has approved the proposed changes.

Timing of Corrections

Applicant is required to submit acceptable corrected drawings within the three month shortened statutory period set in the "Notice of Allowability" (PTO-37). Within that three month period,

Art Unit: 3727

two weeks should be allowed for review of the new drawings by the Office. If a correction is determined to be unacceptable by the Office, applicant must arrange to have an acceptable correction re-submitted within the original three month period to avoid the necessity of obtaining an extension of time with extension fees. Therefore, applicant should file corrected drawings as soon as possible.

Failure to take corrective action within the set (or extended) period will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Reference numeral "34" has been used to describe the curved edge and spring, "42" has been used to describe the retaining member and clip, and "54" has been used to describe the curved edge and spring finger..

Appropriate correction is required.

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: There doesn't appear to be any clear antecedent basis for the clip being removable from the support, as claimed in claim 19.

4. Applicant is advised that should claim 2 be found allowable, claim 4 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight

Art Unit: 3727

difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 10 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant is advised that there doesn't appear to be sufficient structure set forth in claims 10 or 16 for a mere bracket, without any particular structure to form a channel, as claimed.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 9, 16-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sumner, III in view of Littman.

The device claimed is not more than the device of Sumner, III with a stop. To have provided it with an item retaining stop would have been obvious in view of Littman.

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Wheeler.

Art Unit: 3727

To have provided the channels of Sumner, III with retaining fingers to secure items, would have been obvious in view of Wheeler.

8. Claims 6 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims 4 and 17 above, and further in view of Ohlson.

To have made the clip removable and provided retaining means in the base would have been obvious in view of Ohlson.

9. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Cahill.

To have optionally formed the retaining portion at the top of the channel would have been obvious in view of the fingers taught by Cahill.

10. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of either Cocchiaraley or Niernberger

To have made the clip on the same side as the card holder would have been obvious in view of the teaching of either Cocchiaraley or Niernberger.

11. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kraemer.

To have formed the money clip as a hinged clip for secure retention of the currency, would have been obvious in view of the teaching of Kraemer.


Art Unit: 3727

12. Claims 13-15 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents show other money clips and card holders

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sue A. Weaver whose telephone number is (703) 308-1186 on Tuesday-Friday.

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Group 3720 is encouraging Faxing of responses to Office actions directly into the Group at (703) 305-3579. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used to file papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and Art Unit 3727 at the top of your cover sheet.


Sue A. Weaver
Primary Examiner

SW

April 20, 1999